



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,169	01/26/2001	Andrew Saxon	UC053.001A	8085
25213	7590	02/08/2007	EXAMINER	
HELLER EHRLMAN LLP 275 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD MENLO PARK, CA 94025-3506			SCHWADRON, RONALD B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1644	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS	02/08/2007		PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/770,169	SAXON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.	1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3,5,8 and 21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4,6,7,9-20,22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on 11/17/03 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that are stated. This is not found persuasive because the claimed nucleic acid molecule can be used to produce the protein encoded by said nucleic acid. In addition, applicant has indicated that the claimed inventions are patentably independent (see page 2, penultimate paragraph)..

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 23-48 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 11/17/03.

3. Applicant's election of the species noted in the reply filed on 8/2/06 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

4. Claims 3,5,8,21 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 8/2/06.

5. Regarding the proposed corrected drawing filed 11/4/02, said proposed changes would result in two different drawings listed as Figure 7.

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

It is apparent that the vectors recited in claim 15 (XF-1, XF-5a, XF-8, XF-2a, XF-2b, XF-6a and XF-6b) are required to practice the instant invention as recited in said claim. As a required element, said vectors must be known and readily available to the public or obtainable by a repeatable method set forth in the specification. If said vectors are not so obtainable or available, the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, may be satisfied by a deposit of the vectors. See 37 CFR 1.802.

The specification does not provide a repeatable method for producing said vectors. Whilst there is partial guidance in the specification as to how to produce said vectors, the guidance provided does not disclose how to produce vectors identical to said vectors in that the complete nucleic acid sequence of the vectors is not disclosed and there are portions of the vector sequence which are unknown in view of the teachings of the specification. Deposit of said vectors would satisfy the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. In addition, the identifying information set forth in 37 CFR 1.809 (d) should be added to the specification. The requirements under 37 CFR 1.808 can be met by submission of an affidavit or declaration by applicants or someone associated with the patent owner who is in a position to make such assurances, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature, stating that the deposit has been made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty and that all restrictions imposed by the depositor on the availability of the public of the deposited material will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent, would satisfy the deposit requirements. See 37 CFR 1.801-1.809 for additional explanation of these requirements.

8. Claims 1,2,4,6,7,9-14,16-20,22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed invention. The legal standard for sufficiency of a patent's (or a specification's) written description is whether that description "reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at that time of the . . . claimed subject matter", Vas-Cath, Inc. V. Mahurkar, 19 U.S.P.Q.2d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the instant case, the specification does not convey to the artisan that the applicant had possession at the time of invention of the claimed inventions.

Regarding claim 1, part (a) and (b) and claims 2/5, the specification (page 13, second paragraph) discloses that the S1 and S2 nucleotide sequences would encompass mutants and variants of art known S1 and S2 molecules. Furthermore, the S1 and S2 molecule could be derived from any species wherein it is unclear as to what species of nucleic acids encoding S1 and S2 were known in the art at the time the invention was made. Thus, the claims encompass nucleic acids encoding a potentially vast collection of mutants or species that were not known in the prior art or disclosed in the specification and wherein the nucleic acid sequence of said molecules was unpredictable. Regarding claim 12, whilst the claim is limited to human nucleic acid S1 and S2 sequences, said sequences would still encompass undescribed mutants and variants as per above. Regarding claim 13, said claim encompasses any cytokine-inducible promoter wherein it is unclear as to how many of said nucleic acid sequences (other than that of claim 14) were known in the art at the time of filing of the instant application. The only example of a cytokine-inducible promoter disclosed in the specification is that of claim 14. There are hundreds of cytokines known in the art yet is unclear as to how nucleic acids encoding a cytokine-inducible promoter for each of said cytokines were known in the art. Furthermore, the nucleic acid could be derived from any species wherein it is unclear as to what species of nucleic acids encoding cytokine inducible promoters were known in the art at the time the invention was made. The structure of the aforesaid unknown molecules appears to be unpredictable in view of the teachings of the specification.

The skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed structure of the encompassed molecules and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and a reference to a potential method of isolating it. In the instant application, the nucleic acid itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ 2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Lts.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

In view of the aforementioned problems regarding description of the claimed invention, the specification does not provide an adequate written description of the invention claimed herein. See *The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Company*, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404-7 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 39 U.S.P.Q.2d 1225 (Fed. Cir. 1995) the inventors claimed a genus of DNA species encoding insulin in different vertebrates or mammals, but had only described a single species of cDNA which encoded rat insulin. The court held that only the nucleic acids species described in the specification (i.e. nucleic acids encoding rat insulin) met the description requirement and that the inventors were not entitled to a claim encompassing a genus of nucleic acids encoding insulin from other vertebrates, mammals or humans, id. at 1240. The Federal Circuit has held that if an inventor is "unable to envision the detailed constitution of a gene so as to distinguish it from other materials... conception has not been achieved until reduction to practice has occurred", *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co, Ltd.*, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1016 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Attention is also directed to the decision of *The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Company* (CAFC, July 1997) wherein is stated:

"The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See *In re Wilder*, 736 F.2d 1516, 222 USPQ 369, 372-373 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (affirming rejection because the specification does "little more than outline[e] goals appellants hope the

claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate."). Accordingly, naming a type of material generally known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that material. Thus, as we have previously held, a cDNA is not defined or described by the mere name "cDNA," even if accompanied by the name of the protein that it encodes, but requires a kind of specificity usually achieved by means of the recitation of the sequence of nucleotides that make up the cDNA." See Fiers, 984 F.2d at 1171, 25 USPQ2d at 1606.

8. No claim is allowed.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ron Schwadron, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571 272-0851. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571 272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1644


RONALD D. SCHWADRON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1644